IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL, CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.2342 OF 2005

Maharashtra Suraksha Rakshak Aghadi..Petitioner

Vs.

The Security Guards Board for

Greater Bombay and Thane Dist & Ors..Respondents

Mr. Susheel Mahadeshwar, for the Petitioner
Mr. M.S. Topkar, for respondent No.1.

CORAM: F.I. REBELLO &
ANOOP V. MOHTA, JJ.
DATE: 16TH OCTOBER,2006

P.C.

. Appearance has been put up on behalf of respondent NO.1. Though respondent Nos.. 2 and 3 have been served, no appearance has been put up. Considering the controversy petition can be disposed of at this stage itself.

2. Our attention is invited to the inspection report carried out by the officers of the respondent No.1 which will show that the respondent No..2 has engaged security guards, but is not registered with respondent No.1. The petitioner has filed this petition on behalf of guards listed at Annexure "A" to the petition. Neither the respondent No.2 nor the Respondent No.3 have put in appearance. Counsel for the petitioner, however, informs us that there is no notification in so far as the guards whose names are

listed at Annexure "A". Considering the above the petition is disposed of by issuing the following directions:-

(i) The Application of the guards at Annexure"A" are pending with respondent No.1. The respondent No.1 to consider the same and pass appropriate orders at any rate not later than six weeks from today.

(ii) Considering that the respondent NO.2 is not registered and engaging security guards who are not registered the respondent No.1 to take steps to initiate prosecution against the respondent No.2 according to law.

(iii) Rule made absolute accordingly. No order as to costs.

(F.I. REBELLO, J)

(ANOOP V. MOHTA,J).